



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,416	08/29/2003	David Edwin Zapp	DEZ 001 P2	6570
7590	03/09/2004		EXAMINER	
Patrick P. Phillips Kremblas, Foster, Phillips & Pollick 7632 Slate Ridge Boulevard Reynoldsburg, OH 43068			PRICE, CARL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,416

Applicant(s)

ZAPP, DAVID EDWIN

Examiner

CARL D. PRICE

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08-12-2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-28-2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, **unless** the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### **Drawings**

The drawings were received on 12-08-2003. These drawings are approved, in part, by the examiner. The drawing sheets marked 1/4, 3/4 and 4/4 have been approved by the examiner. The drawing sheet marked 2/4 has not been approved by the examiner because the open top defined by the "top edge 22" is not properly illustrated. See original drawing figure 3 showing an open top "cup".

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 4, 13-15,18: rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claims 4, 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims are vague and indefinite. For example, in claim 4, line 3, there is no proper antecedent basis for "the top edge" and "the bottom surface". Also, in claim 13, the phrase "wherein the cone is located above the second chamber member bottom" defines structure (e.g. - 'the cone located above the first chamber planar member') conflicting with the structure defined in claim 12, from which claim 13 depends. See also claim 14 which places the cone "in an intermediate chamber".

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 3749

*The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).*

**Claims 1,9,12,13: rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1,9,12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suci.

In the claims the statement "A charcoal fire starter" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 11951).

In regard to claim 12, the phrase "being able to have placed thereon a first fuel source ..." is deemed a recitation of intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art.

Art Unit: 3749

See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Suciu shows and discloses fire starter comprising a first chamber (2), the first chamber having a sidewall (3) with at least one aperture (4), a top edge (15,16), and a bottom surface (6), the first chamber having a planar member (17) disposed horizontally intermediate the top edge and the bottom surface, the planar member having at least one aperture formed therein, a second chamber in cooperating relationship with the first chamber, the second chamber having a sidewall (18), a top edge Not referenced), and a bottom surface (19), the bottom surface having at least one aperture (note the surface is a woven screen), the second chamber having a cone (D,20,22) atop the bottom surface (19) and spaced inwardly of the second chamber sidewall (18), the second chamber bottom (19) surface located above the first chamber planar member (17). In regard to claim 9, the planar member (17) is removable from the first chamber.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3749

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

**Claims 1-3,5-7,9,10-13 and 16: rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1-3,5-7,9,10-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Henderson (U.S. Patent No.- 3765397) in view of Higman (U.S. Patent No.- 2488014).

In the claims the statement "A charcoal fire starter" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 11951).

In regard to claim 12, the phrase "being able to have placed thereon a first fuel source ..." is deemed a recitation of intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of

Art Unit: 3749

making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art.

See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Henderson shows (figures 1,2,3) and discloses fire starter comprising a first chamber (14), the first chamber having a sidewall (36) with at least one aperture (50) located in only one side, a top edge (34), and a bottom surface (54), the first chamber having a planar member (48) disposed horizontally intermediate the top edge and the bottom surface, the planar member having at least one aperture formed therein, a second chamber having a flanged bottom edge (18) in telescopic cooperating relationship with the first chamber, the second chamber having a sidewall with handles (32) attached thereto, a top edge (at 34), and a bottom surface (28) having at least one aperture (note the surface is a perforated grate). The top edge of the second chamber includes a removable grill (22). The second chamber bottom (19) surface located above the first chamber planar member (17). Henderson however does not show the second chamber having a cone atop the bottom surface and spaced inwardly of the second chamber sidewall, In regard to claim 9, the planar member (28) is removable from the first chamber.

Higman teaches, form the same solid fuel stove field of endeavor as Henderson, placing a conical member atop a perforated planar member to aide in starting ignition of a solid fuel such as charcoal.



Art Unit: 3749

In regard to claim 1-3,5-7,9,10-13 and 16, for the purpose of aiding in the ignition of solid fuel, such as charcoal, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Henderson stove to include a conical member located either on the planar or bottom surfaces (28,48,54), in view of the teaching of Higman. In regard to claims 11, 17 and 18, for example, since the shape of the chambers would depend on numerous design concerns such as the overall size of the stove, the amount of fuel to be consumed, the type of fuel, etc., to form the chambers as cylinders can be viewed as nothing more than a mere matter of choice in design absent the showing of any new or unexpected results produced therefrom over the prior art of record.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 4,14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

**Conclusion**

See the attached PTO FORM 892 for prior art made of record and not relied upon and which are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Art Unit: 3749

**USPTO CUSTOMER CONTACT INFORMATION**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARL D. PRICE whose telephone number is 703-308-1953. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on 703-308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
CARL D. PRICE  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3749

cp